

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

set forth below.

The parties stipulate and request that the Court find the following as a factual basis for excluding the time pursuant to the Speedy Trial Act:

- (1) Defense counsel Mary Conn is currently scheduled to appear in Santa Cruz County Superior Court for an unrelated jury trial and is unavailable on December 3, 2007.
- **(2)** In addition, the government is in the process of preparing and providing discovery in this case. An exclusion of time is necessary to afford the government time to complete the discovery process and to permit the defense to adequately assess the discovery and make informed decisions regarding any possible trial in this case.

For these reasons, the parties agree that a continuance is necessary to ensure that counsel is available and prepared to make informed decisions regarding the case, and denial of such a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant effective case preparation pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161 (h)(8)(A) and 3161(h)(B)(iv).

Dated: November 30, 2007	Respectfully submitted,
	MARY E. CONN & ASSOCIATES
	Mary Elizabeth Conn,
	Attorney for Defendant Ricardo Saez
	SCOTT N. SCHOOLS
	United States Attorney
	/s/
	Thomas M. O'Connell, AUSA

By permission

1		
2	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
3	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
4	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
5	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) No. CR 07-00504 JW	
6		
7	Plaintiff,) vs.	
8) ORDER EXCLUDING TIME	
9) PURSUANT TO SPEEDY TRIAL ACT	
10)	
11	RICARDO SAEZ,	
12	Defendant.)	
13		
14	FOR THE REASONS SET FORTH ABOVE IN THE STIPULATION BETWEEN	
15	THE PARTIES, THE COURT INDEPENDENTLY FINDS, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED	
16	that the time from December 3, 2007 to January 7, 2008 is excluded from the Speedy Trial	
17	Act requirements of Title 18, United States Code, Section 3161 pursuant to Title 18, United	
18	States Code, Sections 3161(h)(8)(A) and 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv). The Court finds that the time is	
19	excludable in that the ends of justice served by granting this continuance outweigh the best	
	interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. The failure to grant the	
20	requested continuance would deny defense counsel reasonable time necessary for effective	
21	preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and would result in a	
22	miscarriage of justice. The Court therefore concludes that this exclusion of time should be	
23	made under 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(8)(A) and (B)(iv).	
24	IT IS SO ORDERED. The Stipulation to continue hearing is denied as MOOT.	
25	Statu Co	
26	DATED:December 11, 2007 UNITED S Queen UNITED S	
27	Ware	